THE HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF THE CHURCH

28038
T632

ING PEAKE JOHNSON

Class 280.3S Book J632
General Theological Seminary Library
CHELSEA SQUARE. NEW YORK

PRESENTED BY
The Author.

THE HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF THE CHURCH

The Historical Development of the Church

By
IRVING PEAKE JOHNSON
Bishop of Colorado
and
Editor of The Witness

'91
G.T.S.

Chicago
THE WITNESS PUBLISHING CO.
1921

280.3
J632
70607

Copyright by
THE WITNESS PUBLISHING CO.
1921

GEN. THEO. SEMIN.
LIBRARY
NEW YORK

Book Number One
of The Witness
Series of Religious
Publications

CONTENTS

The Essentials.

I. The Continuity of History.
II. The Marks of the Church.
III. Differences of Administration.

The Field.

I. The Changing World.
II. The Roman World.
III. The Councils.

The Feudal World.

I. The Rise of the Papacy.
II. The Organization of Society.
III. The Rise of Parliaments.

The Church in England.

I. The Early History.
II. Politics and Religion.
III. Henry and His Children.

The Church of England.

I. The New World.
II. The Continuity of the Church.
III. Since the days of Elizabeth.

THE ESSENTIALS

I. The Continuity of History

HISTORY is the sum of human experience. It is the field of the Cloth of Gold. Time is the warp upon which is woven the woof of events which are related to one another. Upon this cloth there is also applique work which is not related to the texture of the cloth.

It is the business of the historian to study this texture in order to ascertain how God's purpose is being accomplished.

History is not a brief in which we endeavor to defend some par-

ticular view that we may have, but rather an instrument by which we may test all views and ascertain their relation to God's plan as written throughout the ages. The study of history is like the study of organic life, for in it we see how God has been unfolding his purpose in succeeding epochs.

Church History is entwined with secular history and cannot be separated therefrom. The Church is the most venerable of all human institutions, for it is that institution in which God has dealt with man's religious experience. The Church has existed in the kingdoms of this world and has been intimately related to their life and polity. It has persisted through changing dynasties and has never been so dominated by

them as to lose its own continuity and purpose.

The History of the Church begins with the covenant made unto Abraham and includes the Law of Moses, the Ritual of Aaron, the Poetry of David, the History of Ezra, the Prophecy of Isaiah, the Preaching of John Baptist, the Life of Christ, the Work of St. Paul, the Story of the General Councils, the Rise of Papal Power, the Conflict between Church and State, the Process of the Reformation and Growth of National Churches and various Denominations.

There is no civilized state that has a continuous record which can compare in absorbing interest with the relation of the Church to the changing order of the kingdoms

of this world. It is a wonderful story of God's dealing with man's redemption which warrants the closest study.

This plan of Almighty God is not a series of unrelated incidents, but a continuous plan, having certain fundamental principles which run through the whole organism and which man ought not to ignore. It is the carrying out of "the oath which he sware to our father Abraham that He would give us." It is the unfolding of the plan that He "promised to our forefathers, Abraham and his seed forever."

Thus Zacharias and the Virgin Mother proclaimed the principle of the continuity in God's plan and purpose. Upon this foundation Christ builded His Church and the

Gates of Hell have not prevailed against it.

II. The Marks of the Church.

GOD deals with man through institutions. The family, the tribe, the state and the Church are the instruments through which God has developed the social and religious instincts of mankind.

Besides these institutions of venerable antiquity, man has created societies—lodges, corporations and religious sects in which the principles animating institutions are maintained.

What are these fundamental principles without which no institution can exist or preserve its identity? When we discover these laws of social corporations,

we will be able to understand the marks or characteristics of the Christian Church.

In every society organized for religious, social or political purposes there are certain continuous threads upon which the fabric is woven:

(a) **In every such society there must be a constitution or statement of principles for which it exists.**

One may talk of an invisible state or church, but it really means nothing. Unless there are certain definite principles for which the society exists, it will soon disintegrate for lack of purpose. As soon as you dissipate the dogmas of the Church, you destroy the organization which was founded to perpetuate those dogmas.

(b) In every such society there must be official instruments or officers by whom it is preserved.

This involves a line of officers regularly selected and inaugurated who receive by some specific initiatory rite those members who are to be affiliated with them in their common fellowship. Without such an official line no corporation could pass on its principles or its property to those who would inherit its blessings.

(c) In every such society there are certain rites or ceremonies which set forth the principles of the society.

In every fraternity there must needs be a certain expression of the principles for which said society stands, and in a society formed to worship God this expression

will take the form of a ritual or liturgy.

If you will examine any fraternity formed for social, religious or political purposes you will find these three principles characterize such society.

So the Church has three essential elements, viz.: Its faith, order and worship; and without the continuous expression of these elements the Church must cease to exist as a society founded by Jesus Christ and continuously operating in the world. The Church as an historic institution has never ceased for a single moment to manifest these essential marks or characteristics. The Church has never ceased to continue steadfastly "in the Apostle's doctrine and fellowship, in the

breaking of bread and the prayers."

III. Differences of Administration

CLOSELY related to the essential marks of the Church is the question of ecclesiastical administration, or where the authority for discipline resides. The exercise of authority is so closely related to the essential marks of the Church's life that it is frequently confused with that life. Whether the government of the Church is synodical, papal, episcopal, presbyterial or congregational is not a question which affects the life of the Church, but rather one of administration.

For example, the Kingdom of Great Britain has been a continuous organism, even though in 1500

it was administered by a king and in 1900 by a parliament. There are differences of administration, but there is one body and one spirit.

So the emphasis laid upon Church government by Papist, Anglican or Congregationalist deals rather with the matter of administration than with the vital existence of the Body of Christ.

The primary question is not how the Church is to be administered, but what the Church is which we propose to administer. And the basis of unity in the Church is not the claim of Pope or Presbytery, but whether it is a fact that we have preserved the Apostolic faith and order and worship, and whether the words which the duly ordained priest says at the altar are

such as the Lord has commanded us to say. It is a vital question which must be answered before we can enter into the discussion of less important issues.

In short, the unity of the Church is not one of administrative agreement. If it were, there would have been no unity; but the Unity of the Church consists in the fact that there is one Lord, one faith, one baptism, and that we are actually one in the body and blood of Christ. Patriarchs and Synods may thunder anathemas at one another, but the member of Christ's body is not dismembered thereby.

The continuity of the Church has never been dependent upon one Pope, one synod, one presbyter. Policies and politics are not to be confused with the fact

that Christ is not divided, nor can be, by the prejudices and passions of His butlers and stewards.

It is a matter of fact that, so far as the historic Church is concerned, what each priest says at the font and at the altar is identically the same, and the reality of that which he does is not affected by rubrics, canons and canonical obedience. He may serve under Pope, Patriarch or Prelate, but he does the same thing in obedience to Christ.

THE FIELD

I. The Changing World.

THE Church of the Living God has maintained its integrity through a variety of civil administrations. It has existed in the tents of Israel, in the tabernacle of Samuel and the temple of Solomon. It has persevered through the absolutism of Assyrian, Egyptian and Macedonian tyrants. It has kept its identity through the Roman Empire, Feudal Chaos, and National Rivalries.

It has been the one continuous institution through three separate and different worlds since the times

of Christ; worlds so separate that one has been unable to understand the other and each world has left its imprint upon that branch of the Church that has been affected by it.

In the Eastern Church we shall discover fossil remains of that great Roman Empire of which it was the outstanding force. In the Roman Church we shall find fossil remains of that Holy Roman Empire known as the middle Ages, of which it has been truthfully and facetiously said that it was neither Holy nor Roman nor an Empire. In the Anglican Church we shall find an institution which bears the marks of the new National Consciousness which had its rise in the period of Parliamentary government. And in the various denom-

inations we shall see the evidences of that convulsion which shook Christendom at the time of the Reformation. It is all woven in the Cloth of Gold and it forms a story which can be easily traced in its various manifestations.

You will see that the essential factors in the continuing Church have been preserved through the changing order and that such differences of administration as have arisen and been preserved, have had their source in the secular environment, and that while they have disrupted the visible unity of the Church, they have not prevented the Church in its several parts from administering Grace to its various constituent parts. Greek, Roman and Anglican have the same faith, the same order of

ministry, the same sacramental life, in spite of various additions, subtractions, multiplications and divisions that have characterized each of these great communions.

There have been differences of administration but the same Lord, the same faith, the same baptism and the same sacrament of the altar. The Ecclesiastical polity has changed and made many ecclesiastical politicians, but the blood of Christ has come down through the Body of Christ in His various members.

II. The Roman World.

THE Christian Church was founded upon the Hebrew Church in a world that was dominated by the Roman Emperor.

It grew up in this environment and its organization was largely affected thereby. The words parish, diocese, province, are merely adaptations of Roman civil divisions to the Church's need.

But while the primitive Church borrowed its nomenclature from the Roman Empire, it refused to accept the principle of imperial tyranny that tortured that Empire. By the prevision of Christ and from the days of Pentecost, the Church has been a democratic constitutional government. The period of the Roman Empire was the period of synods and councils and no vital pronouncements during this period (A. D. 29-600) was permitted to be put forth by any ecclesiastical imperator.

During the first three centuries

the Church dared not express itself in public assemblies because it was a religion forbidden by the state subject to death penalties. But in the days of Constantine, a serious disagreement arose in the Church at Alexandria between a popular priest, Arius, and his bishop over the deity of Christ. Arius maintained that "there was a time when Christ was not" and therefore his bishop replied that Christians were idolaters who worshipped a creature.

III. The Councils.

IT was the political instincts of Constantine, surrounded by pagan adversaries, which made it imperative that the Christians upon whose support he rested should

not be beset by division. He bade the disputants to cease, and when this was ineffective he summoned the bishops of Christendom to meet at his summer palace in Nicæa and settle the controversy. Constantine was not a theologian. He was not even baptized, but he was a politician and so he endeavored to utilize the method which his Christian advisers suggested to meet the difficulty. It would have been less troublesome to have referred the matter to the Vatican had any one suspected that such a method would be acceptable to Christians, but no one suggested it because no one dreamed that such a matter could be settled in such a manner.

The Roman Church is forced to accept the General Council of

Nicæa, which was a free assembly in which the principle of self-determination was vindicated. Constantine made no effort to dominate the decision, because it was beyond his understanding, but he was quick to seize upon the almost unanimous testimony of the Council as the faith which he would enforce.

Following this Council were three other great Councils, in which Greek thought and the Greek language were prevalent.

It was at the Council of Chalcedon in 451 that the rising Papal pretentions received their rebuke from the last tribunal of the whole Church which has been permitted to pass upon the question. Each Council in turn had conceded to Rome, a primacy of honor. At

Chalcedon the great St. Leo, standing amid the crumbling ruins of the Western Roman Empire, its most dominating figure, attempted to coerce the Council. He would have it meet in the West; it met in the East. He would have it give no further doctrinal definitions of the faith; it ignored the demand. He required that the primacy of Rome should be declared as based upon the fact that it was St. Peter's See. This the Council refused to do and in its twenty-eighth Canon awarded to Rome an honor similar to that bestowed by previous Councils, but based it upon the fact that Rome was the imperial city.

Up to the fall of Rome in the Fifth Century the whole Church had definitely refused to depart

from a conciliar government or to accept the Roman Pontiff as its dictator.

From Leo the Great to Gregory the Great the Western world was in a state of civil chaos, and while two more General Councils were held, they were necessarily unimportant in their decrees.

It was Gregory the Great who rebuked the Patriarch of Constantinople for presuming to claim the title of Universal Bishop, and in that rebuke made no counter claim for similar distinction.

The Church of the early centuries was governed by councils and synods presided over by patriarchs or their representatives, and to this day the Eastern Church has preserved this method of administration. If you go to

Constantinople, Jerusalem or Egypt on ecclesiastical business, you will not be met by an imperial patriarch, greatly as he is honored, but you will be met by the Patriarch and his synod, which will be summoned for the occasion.

The papal idea of an infallible vicar of Christ has never found lodgment in the great Eastern Communion, but has always been repugnant to its invariable instincts. The Greek Church has preserved through centuries of Moslem tyranny the organization which it inherited from its early practice. It is the unmovable breakwater upon which the claims of the Roman See have broken in vain, even when she could have received Western aid against the Moslem as the price of her sub-

mission. The Greek Church has preserved inviolate the primitive policy of administration by synods and councils under the leadership of Patriarchs.

THE FEUDAL WORLD

I. The Rise of the Papacy.

IN the primitive Church the great Patriarchs of Rome, Constantinople, Alexandria, Ephesus—in fact, all Patriarchs—had certain duties. They were the duties of a Court of Appeal when difficulties arose between bishops in their several jurisdictions. These jurisdictions were limited to an area that bore a certain relationship to the Patriarchal See. When the Bishop of Rome exceeded his jurisdiction and attempted to reverse the decision of the Church in North Africa he was rebuked by the great

Cyprian for not attending to his own affairs.

It was during the reign of the youthful Gratian that the pagan title of Pontifex Maximus was disclaimed by a Christian Emperor and paved the way for the thing represented by that title to be picked up by an ambitious Pope. It was during this short reign that the Bishop of Rome requested that his patriarchal jurisdiction be enlarged, and it was this same generous youth, who had himself declined the office of Pontifex Maximus, who issued an imperial rescript giving to the Roman Pontiff appellate jurisdiction over the Western Church.

It is from this same period that the authentic papal decretals date. (A papal decretal is like a decision

of the Supreme Court and acted as a precedent in subsequent actions). It is significant that no previous decretals could be found and that decretals were forged to bolster up the argument of the Petrine claims.

It was a curious world that was emerging in the West out of the wreck of the Roman Empire during the sixth century, and which determined the civil status of Western Europe for many centuries. It was a topsy turvy world, in which barbaric kings captured an ancient civilization and dragged it down to barbaric levels.

In this topsy turvy world the Roman Church was the one institution of Roman civilization that survived, and while it naturally deteriorated in deference to its environment, still preserved its vigor

and tenacity. The claim of spiritual domination to Western Europe was disputed by no rival Apostolic See and was in the main agreeable to those civil rulers who looked to Rome for spiritual leadership.

The temporal claims of the Roman See arose as follows: When Pippin aspired to rise from a Mayor of the Palace to the actual sovereign of the Franks, he wrested certain states from the Lombards, who were hostile to Rome, and gave them to the Pope as Papal States. He was anointed, in turn, as King of the Franks. Each gave to the other that which he did not possess and each profited by the commerce in other men's possessions.

Later on there was forged a

document known as the Donation of Constantine which claimed that the original temporal power was bestowed upon the Roman Pontiff by that grateful monarch, and so, if the document had been genuine, Pippin had merely restored to Rome a right that it had already possessed. During the same period of debased learning, a document was forged which supplied decretals from the time of St. Peter to that of Siricius, the contemporary Pope of the Emperor Gratian. Unfortunately, the monk who made the forgery used the translation of Jerome (400 A. D.) to put biblical references in the mouths of Popes who lived in the first three centuries. Thus fortified by two forged documents which received universal credence

for a thousand years in an uncritical age, successive Pontiffs made enlarged claims as to Papal power.

II. The Organization of Society.

THE Feudal ages were queer ages—difficult for us to understand. Society was pyramidal, consisting of various layers—slaves, peasants, yeomen, knights, barons, earls, dukes, princes, kings, and a purely theoretical emperor to cap the pyramid. The Church organized itself in similar strata. Each man of that feudal age, in both Church and State, was another man's man and took an oath of fealty to someone above him until the two caps were reached. Presumably these two took an oath to God but did not

always consult Him. Thus society was bound together from bottom to top with solemn oaths of service, but society was not bound together from side to side by much of any consideration.

The Western world consisted of an innumerable number of petty principalities which owed some vague allegiance to some larger power but in most things did pretty much as it pleased. It has been aptly described as "barbarism protesting against itself," and so far as human conduct is concerned it was far more barbaric than Christian.

In such a multitude of petty tyrants it was well and, I believe, of divine purpose that the Church should have a central power, which petty tyrants must respect and

fear, and which could save the local Churches from being strangled by brutal lords. The Papacy was a mediæval necessity if the Church was to function in any large way.

The rise of papal power was due to a situation imposed by political opportunity and necessity. From the modest claims of Gregory the Great (600) to the exalted claim of Boniface (1300), who said that all "kings were subject to him and he alone to God," is a long road which we cannot travel together.

It is sufficient for our purpose to show that just as there had been a conciliar Church in the Roman Empire—which the Greeks have preserved—so there was a mediæval Church, adapting its administrative policy to the needs of the

time and continuing that administrative policy into the new world which grew out of it.

III. The Rise of Parliaments.

THE history of the Middle Ages is the struggle of Pope and Emperor for supremacy, which struggle was won by the papacy, only to bow before a new force which came out of the struggle, and that new force was the rise of national parliaments.

When Boniface was engaged in mortal conflict for power with Philip of France, the latter found it necessary to include the bourgeoisie in his resistance. It was to meet the aggressions of the Pope that Philip summoned the Third Estate out of which came the

French Assembly; just as for the same reasons in England Edward formed a parliament in which was included the common people of England.

It was the beginning of a new era—that of national consciousness. It was followed by the use of gunpowder which levelled baronial castles, and the invention of the printing press which disseminated universal knowledge, and the rise of the reformers which shattered the elaborate plans of papal domination.

As in the Fifth Century the sack of Rome caused a social upheaval that created a new world, so in the Fifteenth Century there was a social and religious upheaval which changed the fabric of society and substituted for the long feudal

age, the new era of national consciousness, national rivalry and national religious expression.

It was on English soil, separated from the main land by the sea and from the rest of Europe by her necessary isolation, that the new world found its most conspicuous expression.

THE CHURCH IN ENGLAND

I. The Early History.

THERE is no history of the Church in England prior to the time of Constantine. That there was a Church there we know and that this Church was represented at the Council of Arles (in 318 A. D.) we know. Also so far as incident is concerned we know nothing of what transpired in the camps of the Roman legions or in the villages of the ancient Celts during this period.

We know a little about the Fourth Century, but when the Roman legions were summoned from

Britain to aid in the defense of Rome, the island was ravaged by pagan Anglo-Saxons and the Britons were driven into Wales and the solitary places. Outside of the hectic emotional ravings of a single monk we know little of this dark period.

We know that there was a British Church and that it preserved tenaciously the faith and customs of the earliest days, so when the Latin Monk, Augustine (596 A. D.) found the British Church it was a survival of early days, had been outside the stream of European life, and bore none of the changes which had taken place in Rome and elsewhere.

It was the Church of the Sixth Century under Gregory the Great coming in contact with the Church

of the Fourth Century unaltered and unaffected by the Continental changes. It had its provincial usages and declined to conform to what it regarded as the modern usages of the Roman Church. It had not yet suffered from the passion for uniformity which was the genius of the Latin mind as distinguished from the domination of the Greek mind in the first four centuries. Except for these little bands of Celtic Christians whose relation to that of their pagan Saxon conquerors was somewhat similar to that of our Indian tribes to the encroachments of the white man, but that here the British tribes were Christian and the Saxon hordes were pagan—except for these Celtic Christians the whole island was pagan.

Its conversion was the joint work, first of the Latin monks, who took the initiative, and then of Christan Celts, who took up the mission. The two streams of Christian effort finally merged by the submersion of the Celtic strain in the stronger and more highly organized stream of Latin effort. But until the days of William the Conqueror, Britain was unlike the Continent in that Feudalism had little place in the Island Kingdom.

II. Politics and Religion.

DURING the Tenth Century the fortunes of the Roman See were at their lowest ebb. The Papacy was the plaything of Italian politicians and designing courtesans, and it exerted very slight

influence on English affairs. Stigand, Archbishop of Canterbury, at the coming of William the Conqueror had been excommunicated by Rome and seemingly was unaffected by the sentence.

The Norman Conquest was an invasion not only of the Kingdom of England, but also of the Church of England, for every Anglo-Saxon Bishop excepting one was displaced by a Norman Ecclesiastic acting under the Papal approval. It is significant that when William the Conqueror rested in his conquest that the great Papal advocate, Hildebrand, was Pope and that he demanded "Peter's Pence" and fealty from the Norman King. Peter's Pence he gave and obedience he refused, because his predecessors had not rendered

the latter but had cheerfully given the former.

It was not until the pusillanimous John had fallen back upon papal aid to suppress the rising spirit of his barons, that the crown of England was handed to the Pope to be received back from his hands; and it was not until the youthful Henry, son of John, had been duly trained by papal legates that Roman supremacy in England was complete and the English Church became popularly known as the "milch cow" of the Pope. And it is no exaggeration to say that she was milked until even the slow acting English mind was rebellious and kicked.

The period from 1300 to 1500 was characterized by constant friction between papal aggression and

English reaction. The statutes of "Mortmain," restraining the possessions of the Church, and "Præmunire," forbidding appeals to Rome, and "Provisors," ousting Italian grafters from English livings, were sign posts of the rising discontent. It is true that the friction was more political and economic than it was religious, although the work of Wycliffe was as ominous as it was popular. It is true that many times the English Church suffered and was robbed by the connivance of the two thieves, King and Pope, as each played into the other's hands. But it is also true that England was tired of Italian interference and ready for any emergency that would release it from this irksome bondage.

Religion in these centuries was more political than personal. The common man had little to say, and when he attempted to act independently, the rulers of State and Church combined to suppress his dangerous enthusiasm. Many Lollards and other enthusiasts found their martyrdom in the attempt. It was a political emergency that had made England subservient to Rome in the Thirteenth Century. It was the domestic economy of the Royal Family that caused the first breach.

III. Henry and His Children.

OF course Henry's divorces and marriages reflected little credit upon the Church in which he was trained, and would have reflected

little credit upon the Church which he might have founded, if he had founded one,—but he didn't. He merely quarrelled with the Pope, went his own way, called himself supreme governor of the Church and died leaving three children, Edward, Mary and Elizabeth, who were to work at this Church problem in various ways after his decease.

Edward, precocious youth, the possessor of greedy uncles who, Tudor-like, continued to plunder the Church, kept up the breach, as it made plundering more profitable.

Mary, daughter of Aragon and wife of Philip, undid all that was done by Henry and his helpless son and returned to alliance with Rome. Whatever had been found-

ed by Henry was unfounded and burned, including Bishops and Prayer Books, and the Roman Pontiff held the reins once more. Whatever Henry founded had perished and nothing remains in the English Church today that can be traced to him or to his reign, excepting one thing only,—the English Litany. Surely one who founded must needs put something into the institution which he founds.

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND

I. The New World.

ELIZABETH'S reign ushered in a new world and a new England. When she ascended the throne all Englishmen were worshipping in one Church and that a papal Church, excepting those who had fled from Mary to Geneva and to Frankfort.

There was no schism. The ancient institution was there, divided in sentiment but undivided in fact. There were three parties in the Church,—Romanists, who would continue in submission to Rome; Puritans, returning from

abroad, who would smash the vase to pieces in order to cleanse it; Anglicans, who had had a taste of freedom from Roman domination without changing their faith and practice.

Elizabeth was a diplomatic soul and had one virtue,—she loved England. It was her own England. But she made no hasty moves. She plotted with her brother-in-law, Philip, against France, and with France against Philip. She met the Pope with evasion and the Puritan, who was less formidable, with assurances. She was determined to break loose from Italian interference, but in breaking she wished to be sure what she was going to have.

The National Consciousness which existed in Elizabeth desired

a National Church which should express the genius of the English people without breaking from the essential faith and worship of the past. She wanted to continue what already was, but she wanted it to be continued without the Pope. And this she succeeded in accomplishing without breaking with the Catholic Church until the Pope excommunicated her and released his subjects from allegiance to her. This was bad for the subjects, because they automatically became enemies of the crown by the implied renunciation of their allegiance to her. It came to pass that the "Recusants," as they were called, found themselves in a bad way, for the excommunication of Elizabeth had caused them to be without a sovereign and without a

country which they could any longer call their own.

The break with Rome during the reign of Elizabeth was not a great upheaval. There were only 189 clerics out of the thousands in England who refused to accept the new regime, and of these fourteen were bishops and six were abbots. The new era was that of the common people and they were not particularly affected by the changes.

II. The Continuity of the Church.

HAD you been living in an English village as a child in the reign of Henry VIII. under a young rector, it would have been entirely possible for you to go on through the period covered by Henry's, Edward's, Mary's and Elizabeth's

reigns worshipping in the same Church under the same rector for the whole period, and except for a change in service books and ornaments, not be conscious of any fundamental difference in faith, order or worship during that period. In matters of ecclesiastical administration you would have had no voice and very little concern. You would have been familiar with the old Mass and Henry's Litany and Edward's first Prayer Book. You would have seen these Prayer Books burned and would have gone back to the old Mass and then had the second Prayer Book of Edward somewhat revised by Elizabethan divines. There would have been no structural change in your religion and no consciousness of any change in

your personal practices except as affected by the change in service books. You would have been extremely puzzled to have been told that a new Church had been founded, and if you had asked your informer "When," he would have been more puzzled still to tell you.

So far as unity with Rome is concerned, it was broken by Paul IV. when he excommunicated Elizabeth because she refused to acknowledge his jurisdiction in England. As a matter of fact the English Church had never broken its continuity with the past, as had the reforming bodies on the Continent, but was rather adapting the Church of the Middle Ages to the changing order of the civil world.

Just as the Roman Church had met the Mediæval world by chang-

ing its claims to meet the chaotic situation and enlarging its administrative functions to deal with the new status of society, so had the English Church met the new world of National Consciousness by adapting the Church's administrative forces to meet the new exigency.

The Latin Countries refused to meet this readjustment in a religious way and consequently we note the change in the world's leadership, which passed from Spain to England.

III. The Days Since Elizabeth.

SINCE the days of Elizabeth the English Church has made no changes in faith, order and worship, but has adapted her admin-

istrative functions to meet the needs of her ever increasing colonies. In the days of Elizabeth there were only a score of bishops and the English Church was limited to Great Britain and her few colonies. Today the Church of England and her affiliated bodies have some six hundred bishops, who cover the whole of English speaking territory.

It was part of the Divine purpose that the Church of English speaking people should not be hampered and paralyzed by the domination of the passing races in Latin countries. How well the English Church has kept that trust is a matter for discussion but, from the study of history, there can be no question that she is a true branch of the Catholic Church adapting

herself to a world-wide need.

And so just as the Greek Church has passed down the administration of the primitive Church unchanged to our days; and as the Roman Church has preserved the polity which was useful in the Middle Ages; so the Anglican Church has preserved the faith, order and worship of antiquity in a way that can adapt itself to the world's changing order if the demand for that adaptation can be produced.

The Roman Church has had ample opportunity to demonstrate its ability to meet the demands of the changing order, especially in those countries where it has entire control of the situation, but it is so hampered by the Mediæval idea of sovereignty that it has never yet

succeeded in gaining a constituency which could co-operate with the changing order.

As for the various religious denominations which were the product of the Reformation upheaval, there is nothing to indicate that they represent the essential features of the Church as an historic institution. They have played their part, no doubt, in the new era, but they lack that principle of continuity which insures permanent results.

GEN. THEO. SEMINARY
LIBRARY
NEW YORK

CORNELL UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY
ITHACA, NEW YORK

280.35
J632
Johnson, I.P.

280.35
J632

C0-AYL-551